

# CREATION AT UGARIT AND IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

BY

LOREN R. FISHER

Claremont, California

## I. The Problem

One way of stating the problem of creation at Ugarit is to ask a question. Is the conflict between Baal and Yamm related to kingship, temple building, or creation? Many times, in a lecture or in a conversation, I have heard it said that the battle between Baal and Yamm in Ugaritic literature is a creation myth. This view is very appealing to me, but it is, at the same time, very difficult. The fact is that most Ugaritic scholars say that the battle only results in kingship.

Marvin POPE says,  
There is hardly anything that could be called a creation story or any clear allusion to cosmic creativity in the Ugaritic texts so far exhumed. . . . It is altogether probable that El was a creator God, but the Ugaritic evidence is by no means explicit.<sup>1)</sup>

Now, if it is difficult to see El as creator, it is certainly more difficult to see Baal in this role. A. S. KAPELRUD suggests that Baal is quite similar to Marduk in that both defeat the Sea Monster, but with Baal no creation is involved <sup>2)</sup>. Baal's battle with Yamm is a struggle for kingship <sup>3)</sup> in which Baal must overcome an enemy who is "supported by the former head of the pantheon" <sup>4)</sup>. Cyrus H. GORDON seems to emphasize kingship as the result of this conflict. He says, "Baal thus conquered Yamm and wrested from him the kingship of the gods" <sup>5)</sup>.

---

<sup>1)</sup> Marvin H. POPE, *El in the Ugaritic Texts*, SVT II, Leiden, 1955, p. 49. Also, Werner SCHMIDT, *Königtum Gottes in Ugarit und Israel*, BZAW, 80, Berlin, 1961, pp. 5, 38, 41, 49—52, sees El as the creator.

<sup>2)</sup> Arvid S. KAPELRUD, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*, Copenhagen, 1952, p. 138.

<sup>3)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 91.

<sup>4)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 106. Also, see POPE, *op. cit.*, p. 92. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 53, is against both KAPELRUD and POPE. He says, "Von einer Fehde zwischen El und Baal wissen die Mythen nichts", and on the same page, "So ist El trotz Baals Königtum weiterhin das Haupt der Götterwelt, wie er auch der 'Schöpfer der Geschöpfe' bleibt, während Baal der Schöpfung Fruchtbarkeit und Leben schenkt".

<sup>5)</sup> Cyrus H. GORDON, *Before the Bible*, New York, 1962, p. 182. It is true that he makes it "one of the main themes" (p. 178) without saying anything about creation.

Again, Sigmund MOWINCKEL notes that the text is difficult, "but it does not seem to have anything to do with creation" <sup>1)</sup>. MOWINCKEL sees El as the creator and Baal as the god of "natural fertility" <sup>2)</sup>. Werner SCHMIDT takes this same position when he says, "...El schuf die Welt (die Götter und die Geschöpfe), Baal erhält die Welt" <sup>3)</sup>. G. R. DRIVER sees the struggle as the entry of Baal into the pantheon and the "establishment of his supremacy, under El's suzerainty, over all the other gods..." <sup>4)</sup>. I am certain that this list could be extended, but this is enough to show that many of the leading scholars think in terms of kingship as the result of conflict.

There are other ways of looking at this battle. Julian OBERMANN sees several themes in this myth but they are all related to a "Building Saga" <sup>5)</sup>. He says,

...Baal's final victory over his enemies and his obtaining 'eternal' kingdom are necessary prerequisites for the fulfillment of his desire... for a house on the Height of Šapon cast of precious metals". <sup>6)</sup>

KAPELRUD would certainly agree that temple building is important<sup>7)</sup>, but "the story of Baal's house building must not be seen separately, apart from the rest of the A. B. cycle" <sup>8)</sup>.

Against this "cloud of witnesses" for kingship or temple building who would dare to speak for creation? Norman K. GOTTWALD might be doing this when he says,

... Prince Yam (Sea) and Judge Nahor (River), represented as warring with Baal and exemplifying the ancient Semitic view that the powers

<sup>1)</sup> Sigmund MOWINCKEL, *The Psalms in Israel's Worship*, trans. by D. R. AP-THOMAS, Nashville, 1962, Vol. II, p. 241, note xxi.

<sup>2)</sup> *Ibid.* Also, note his statement, "In ancient Canaan as well, they spoke of the god's war with, and victory over, the sea and the monsters of the deep. But whether they considered this as an act of *creation* is uncertain; in none of the hitherto known texts does the dragon fight lead to any creation". *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 135. However on pp. 118 and 145 f. he seems inconsistent.

<sup>3)</sup> SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 51. Also, see p. 41 and 50.

<sup>4)</sup> G. R. DRIVER, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*, Edinburgh, 1956, p. 21. SCHMIDT's position (see note 4, p. 311 above) is like this. However, can this be the case? See text 51:V:41 (The numbers are according to GORDON.).

<sup>5)</sup> Julian OBERMANN, *Ugaritic Mythology*, New Haven, 1948, p. xxii.

<sup>6)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>7)</sup> Arvid S. KAPELRUD, "Temple Building, a Task for Gods and Kings", *Orientalia*, 32, 1963, pp. 56 ff.

<sup>8)</sup> KAPELRUD, *Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts*, p. 142. This is certainly correct (see below). SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 8, would also agree at this point.

of chaos stem from the primordial waters that the gods must control in order to create the cosmos" <sup>1</sup>).

Also, John GRAY apparently thinks of conflict resulting in creation. He says, after translating the battle scene,

This then is the Canaanite expression of faith in providence. Order in nature and even in the divine council itself was menaced by the unbridled licence of the powers of Chaos typified by the unruly waters. . . . Order prevails against Chaos" <sup>2</sup>).

GRAY makes the same point in great detail in his book *The Legacy of Canaan* <sup>3</sup>). Here, he says,

There is a cosmic theme represented by the myth of the conflict between Baal and the Unruly Waters, by which Baal secured kingship and established cosmos" <sup>4</sup>).

However, if one stopped here he would have misread GRAY, because he also says, "that the creator in Ugaritic religion is not Baal, but El" <sup>5</sup>). He makes this point in other places as well, and he says that the creation element as it relates to kingship is to be found in the Babylonian myths but not in the Ugaritic <sup>6</sup>). So, for GRAY "Order prevails against Chaos" but this is not creation! Are we playing with words? <sup>7</sup>) Those who say "no creation at Ugarit" must have a very narrow definition of creation. It may mean that they are looking for a *creatio ex nihilo*. Certainly they do not consider "re-creation" or the ordering of chaos as creation. However, some probably mean by "no creation at Ugarit" that there is no "Marduk scene" or a des-

<sup>1</sup>) Norman K. GOTTWALD, *A Light to the Nations*, New York, 1959, p. 149. Does he understand Yamm and Nahor as two gods?

<sup>2</sup>) John GRAY, "The Hebrew Conception of the Kingship of God: Its Origin and Development", *VT*, VI, 1956, p. 273.

<sup>3</sup>) John GRAY, *The Legacy of Canaan*, *SVT* V, Leiden, 1957, pp. 18, 20, 28, 29.

<sup>4</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>5</sup>) *Ibid.*, p. 58, note 4.

<sup>6</sup>) John GRAY, *VT*, VI, *op. cit.*, p. 273, note 1. Here, he says, "In the Babylonian myth, however, the power of providence is manifest in creation, an element so far unattested in the Ras Shamra mythology". Also see GRAY's "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalms", *VT* XI, 1961, p. 6, note 1. Others see the Hebrews as the ones who bring the Canaanite and the Babylonian myths together. See MOWINCKEL, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 135 and 145, and note G. WIDENGREN, "Early Hebrew Myths and Their Interpretation", *Myth, Ritual, and Kingship*, ed. by S. H. HOOKE, Oxford, 1958, p. 173. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 38–42, makes the same point but he has the war and the creation separate in the Old Testament (p. 40). The two are brought together because Yahweh combines them (p. 71, 72). My doubts on this will be discussed below.

<sup>7</sup>) Personally, I think that it is very important to be exact in terminology. It does make a difference how you say something.

cription of the process. Or it can be put into Otto KAISER's words,

Der kampf zwischen Marduk und Tiamat erfolgt vor der Schöpfung der Welt. Der Kampf zwischen Baal und Jam setzt offensichtlich die Welt selbst bereits voraus. Der Sieg begründet das Königtum Baal's über die Erde, aber er schafft diese Erde nicht" <sup>1)</sup>).

However, even for KAISER, Baal's kingship means order and life <sup>2)</sup>).

Is this conflict theme related to kingship, temple building, or creation? I think that this is an improper question. I hope to show in the remainder of this paper that conflict, kingship, ordering of chaos, and temple building are all related to an overarching theme that I would call "creation". However this is not a theogony or a creation of the El type. Rather it is cosmogonic and is of the Baal type. I hope that this will bring some order out of chaos.

## II THE TEXTS

One of the difficulties in dealing with this problem is that of the proper order of the texts. There is some general agreement on the part of the leading translators, but MOWINCKEL and HVIDBERG have departed radically from the norm <sup>3)</sup>. They deal with the Môt text first and in this way they have the death and resurrection of Baal preceeding his enthronement. Thus, the Baal-Yamm conflict is left out of the picture. However, I must object to this arrangement since I think that there is a very real connection between the Baal-Yamm text (Gordon, No. 68), the temple-building text (No. 51), and then the Baal-Môt text (No. 67) <sup>4)</sup>. However, I must also say that I think that the point of this paper could be maintained from any *one* of these texts. At the present I do not think that one should relate the Anat text to the above three, but rather, the Anat text is a separate tradition. However, within the Anat text one can also see that conflict, kingship (Baal is Lord of the earth, Anat:I:3), order/peace (Anat: III:10), and the temple all have cosmic proportions. In Anat: III:18 ff, Baal seems to know the *word* of nature, and it is very interest-

<sup>1)</sup> Otto KAISER, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit, und Israel*, BZAW, 78, Berlin, 1959, p. 76.

<sup>2)</sup> SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 52, would agree. I will deal with my own views on creation below.

<sup>3)</sup> MOWINCKEL, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 132, and Flemming F. HVIDBERG, *Weeping and Laughter in the Old Testament*, trans. by F. LØKKEGAARD, Leiden, 1962, p. 53. MOWINCKEL follows HVIDBERG in this arrangement.

<sup>4)</sup> It may be possible to carry this arrangement on with texts 62 and 49 but this is enough for the point of this paper.

ing that he wants to disclose it to Anat in the Sanctuary on his mountain, even Şapân<sup>1</sup>).

Text 68 tells of the great battle in which Baal fights with Yamm and secures his “eternal” kingship. Therefore, the meaning of this text has to do with the meaning of kingship. It is the meaning of kingship that relates this text to the overarching concept of creation. For the Ugaritic authors it is enough just to state that Baal is king (this is also the case in the Bible where Yahweh is king), and the meaning and the connection with creation is understood. However, for us the situation is more difficult. Therefore, we must turn to text 51 for a full treatment of Baal’s kingship<sup>2</sup>).

The beginning of text 51 is broken, but we are in luck. As VIROLLEAUD has pointed out, 51:V:52 ff. is identical with the first column, line 13 ff., where our text begins<sup>3</sup>). Also, the traces of words in column one indicate that the missing part was identical to 51:V:40-51. Thus the text probably began with a standard formula pronounced by the goddess Asherah saying, *wt’n rbt ašrt ym*, “and Lady Asherah of the Sea answered”<sup>4</sup>). Then she says, “Thy word, O El, is wise” (51:V:41). This is followed by the very important announcement, *mlkn aliy[n] b’l tptn win d’lnh*, “Our king is Aliyn Baal, Yea, our judge, and there is no one who is above him”. Hence, in text 68 Baal wins his kingship and in text 51 it is proclaimed.<sup>5</sup>)

Baal’s kingship has many cosmic connotations. Certainly, his kingship brings peace and order to the cosmos. Also, in 51:IV:69 it is Baal that sets the seasons (This should be compared to Gen. i 14 or better yet to Ps. lxxiv 17 where after the battle with Leviathan it is

<sup>1</sup>) It is interesting that some scholars relate *abn brq* to building materials and even to Ez. xxviii. See POPE, *op. cit.*, p. 99, where he refers to OBERMANN and CASSUTO on this point. This is a very difficult passage.

<sup>2</sup>) This would be helpful even if text 51 was not connected to text 68 as I think it is.

<sup>3</sup>) CH. VIROLLEAUD, “Un nouveau Chant du Poème D’Aleïn-Baal”, *Syria*, XIII, 1932, p. 114.

<sup>4</sup>) This formula is extremely interesting and I will deal with this in a subsequent paper.

<sup>5</sup>) Note that he is both king and judge. Actually, king and judge should be seen as parallel terms. Cyrus GORDON makes a real contribution when he relates the royal epics at Ugarit to the Patriarchal narratives (*op. cit.*, pp. 155, 283.), and his suggestion that “the key to the institution of the Judges is Mycenaean kingship” (*Ibid.*, p. 297) is going to be very fruitful. Then, he says, “It is useful to remember that in Ugaritic the cognates of *mīlek* and *šōfēl* are parallel equivalents of each other”. (*Ibid.*). SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 28, also maintains that *tpt* should be taken in the sense of “to rule”.

said that God makes the summer and the winter. Or, compare the Hebrew flood story.). Now, this great king and judge, Lord of the earth, must have a house and most of text 51 concerns Baal's house or temple <sup>1)</sup>). After permission for the house is secured, and the "good news" is given to Baal, *Ktr-w-Hss* is commissioned to plan and build the house. Nevertheless, when the house is completed Baal says, *<b>hty bnt dt ksp bkly dtm hrš 'dbt*, "My house I created of silver, my temple of gold I arranged". Here, Baal is the builder <sup>2)</sup>!

This temple which Baal builds is a microcosm. I am not the first to say this. MOWINCKEL has stated that Baal's house or temple was also "symbolically the whole world" <sup>3)</sup>). It is also very interesting to point out with KAPELRUD that temple building was not only the task of victorious gods and kings, "...but there is a real connection between mythological temple building and actual temple building" <sup>4)</sup>). Therefore, even as Baal's temple is a microcosm of the world so the temple of Baal in Ugarit was a replica of his temple on Şapân and a microcosm (at least according to Ugaritic belief). The cosmic features of this temple are clearly seen in text 51. In 51:VI, *Ktr-w-Hss* wants to put a window in Baal's house, but Baal is apparently against this because he still fears the defeated Yamm (VI:13) <sup>5)</sup>). After all, according to their world view, any opening might allow the floods to re-enter. However, Baal finally allows a window (51:VII:15 ff.) to be put in his house. This is necessary, because he must send forth his

<sup>1)</sup> SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 57, shows the importance of the temple. He says, "Der Bau eines solchen Hauses ist deutlich die Voraussetzung für die Ausübung der Regierungsgewalt. . . . Göttliches Königtum und Tempel sind untrennbar". He also points up the necessity of a temple for Yahweh in Jerusalem.

<sup>2)</sup> It must be granted that other translations are possible but even if *Ktr-w-Hss* is the intended subject of the verb "to create" or "to build", Baal is the one who is responsible.

<sup>3)</sup> Mowinkel, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 134. Also see Mircea ELIADE, *Cosmos and History*, New York, 1959, p. 17, says, "The very ancient conception of the temple as the *imago mundi*, the idea that the sanctuary reproduces the universe in its essence, passed into the religious architecture of Christian Europe. . . ." Or note his, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, New York, 1958, p. 375. My colleague, Hans Dieter BETZ reminded me of this passage in ELIADE's book.

<sup>4)</sup> KAPELRUD, *Orientalia*, 32, *op. cit.*, p. 56. Also note Frank M. CROSS, Jr., and David Noel FREEDMAN, "The Song of Miriam", *JNES*, XIV, 1955, p. 240, where they write of cosmic temples as the archetypes of earthly temples. Note that they only mention kingship as resulting from conflict with Yamm.

<sup>5)</sup> Yamm is mentioned again in VII:3. Apparently, he is not afraid of Môt at this time unless we identify Môt and Yamm as the O.T. may have done. See Jer. ix 21, Ps. lxxviii 20—22, and MOWINCKEL, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 174. This needs more investigation.

voice. The window in the temple turns out to be a “cleft in the clouds”.

Another feature of this temple which points to its character as a microcosm is the time that it takes to build it. In my paper, “The Temple Quarter”<sup>1)</sup>, I have tried to show that עיר, “city” can also mean “temple quarter” or even the inner sanctuary<sup>2)</sup>. Therefore, it is the city of God in Ps. xlviii, or his temple, that is located on Şapân just as Baal’s temple. Baal’s temple and the temple in Jerusalem are both constructed in terms of seven—seven days and seven years.

If these temples were constructed in terms of ‘seven’ it is really no wonder that the creation poem of Gen. 1 is inserted in a seven-day framework. One must speak of ordering the cosmos in terms of seven even as the construction of the micricosm must be according to the same pattern<sup>3)</sup>.

Hence the new king has a temple which is a microcosm and the ordering of this temple resembles the creation of the cosmos.

Now, after the temple is constructed there is a great banquet. Then we are introduced to Môt who subsequently becomes the great challenger of Baal. Text 51, then, gives meaning to the idea of kingship

<sup>1)</sup> Loren R. FISHER, “The Temple Quarter”, *JSS*, 8, 1963, pp. 34 ff.

<sup>2)</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 37. It is very interesting that Mircea ELIADE writes of the microcosmic character of the city, temple, and even the altar. Note his article, “The Prestige of the Cosmogonic Myth”, *The Divinity School News*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, Feb. 1959, (reprinted from *Diogenes*, No. 23, Autumn, 1958), p. 6, 8, 11. However, I have shown the inner connection of these three in the above article. Also I should say that a great deal of additional evidence is available. Note C. F.-A. SCHAEFFER, “Archéologie de l’Asie Occidentale”, *L’Annuaire du Collège de France*, 62<sup>e</sup> Année, Résumé des Cours de 1961—1962, p. 302, “Sur le texte de Ras Shamra, le mot de Kâri étant précédé du déterminatif de ‘ville’, nous pouvons admettre qu’à Ugarit, le Kâri désignait le quartier du port de Minet-el-Beida, où nous avons retrouvé les installations des marchands du port et leurs magasins”. Also Kent RICHARDS, one of my students, has noticed the same thing centering around the discussion of JOSEPHUS, *Jewish Antiquities* XII, 11. 145—146. Note BIKERMAN, “Une proclamation séleucide relative au de Jérusalem”, *Syria*, 25, 1946/8, pp. 67 ff.; TCHERIKOVER, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, pp. 82 ff.; and MARCUS, *Josephus*, Vol. VII (Loeb), Appendix D, pp. 743—766. TCHERIKOVER (*op. cit.*, p. 86) says, “. . . the word ‘city’ does not indicate the *entire* built-up area of Jerusalem, but only its center, that is, the temple and its immediate neighborhood”. Also note his remarks on p. 441, note 126, where he suggests that we need to determine “what area around the temple could have been called ‘the city’ . . .” This shows that he was heading in the right direction. Also, Mr. RICHARDS has noticed that in the *Zadokite Document*, xii, 1 and 2 the term עיר המקדש is used and it means the “temple quarter”.

<sup>3)</sup> FISHER, *op. cit.*, p. 40 f. I do not want to imply that the seven day framework was used only for this.

in terms of the one who sets the seasons and builds a house of cosmic proportions.

Next, we have text 67 which I think should follow text 51. It carries on the Môt vs. Baal theme, but I will only comment on the beginning of the text where Môt is apparently talking to Baal. He says, when you smote Leviathan the heavens collapsed (this is a very difficult passage). Then Môt says that when this happened he died. This certainly has cosmic connotations, and I take it that "the death of Môt" is a way of saying "order out of chaos".

### III. CREATION OF THE BAAL TYPE

In the above three texts we have conflict, kingship, order, temple building (The temple is symbolic of the ordered cosmos and at the same time makes it possible to maintain order. However, that which makes it possible to maintain order is also that which allows for the possible recurrence of chaos), and the banquet. This entire series may be called a creation of the Baal type.<sup>1)</sup> Furthermore, even when only one element in the series is used it must not be separated from the larger context. It must be said that in the Babylonian creation account Marduk is shown in the actual process of ordering the cosmos and then the temple is built and the banquet is held. But these stories are different in several respects. Marduk is made king before his conflict and at Ugarit kingship comes after conflict. At Ugarit we have no description of the process of ordering the cosmos, but nevertheless we have it.<sup>2)</sup> This is also true for the Hebrew enthronement psalms.<sup>3)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> This does not mean that there is no variety in this series. Sometimes it may use God's city or throne instead of his temple, but then these are synonymous. Also, the banquet is not always present, but sometimes, it is assumed by the fact that the people come to the temple.

<sup>2)</sup> One of my students, Mr. John WORRELL, has pointed out that at Ugarit Yamm is not cut into pieces because he must be distinguished from the cosmos in order to threaten it again.

<sup>3)</sup> SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 39, 40, goes too far in trying to separate the conflict from creation in the enthronement psalms. He even says that Is. li 9 ff. is not connected with creation. This is impossible because the hymn which contains this passage is talking about creation. Gerhard VON RAD has made the same point with regard to SCHMIDT's work in his *Theologie Des Alten Testaments*, Band I, München, 1962, p. 164, note 23, . . . "Nun scheint mir aber Schmidts Forderung, die Chaoskampfaussagen seien nur da auf Jahwes Schöpfung zu beziehen, wo dies explizit ausgesprochen werde, in methodischer Hinsicht doch nicht ganz überzeugend. Einige Male wird diese Beziehung hergestellt (Ps. 74; 89), in andern Fällen geschieht es nicht (Ps. 93; 77). Sind diese Texte wirklich anders zu bewerten, nachdem—wie doch Schmidt selbst betont—in Jahwe die Funktionen Baals und des Schöpfergottes El zusammengekommen sind? Was Jer. 51 9f. betrifft,



This creation of the Baal type takes place according to this rather definite pattern, and it also has a definite meaning. This is not a creation out of nothing; it is not a story of absolute origins or the birth of gods. Baal is not the creator of the gods and neither is Marduk <sup>1)</sup>. However, both Baal and Marduk want all authority in heaven, on the earth and in the sea. My thesis is that this creation of the Baal type was more useful and meaningful to the Hebrews than some kind of a creation of the El type or a theogony. Wasn't order more important than ultimate origins? <sup>2)</sup> I have heard it said that Israel could not think about such things as ultimate origins. Why not? The rest of the East Mediterranean world did this sort of thing <sup>3)</sup> They could have thought in these terms but they chose not to do so. Creation of the El type brought in too many problems, so they rejected it <sup>4)</sup>. They were not as worried about dualism or the problem of evil as we. They were concerned about the problems that a parent-god, who spewed out others gods, would give them. On the other hand, creation of the Baal type has to do with a kind of creation that has fewer problems and at the same time is more useful. They can use this for that which really matters, namely: their world and their own existence <sup>5)</sup>.

---

so scheint mir die herkömmliche Deutung auf die Schöpfung angesichts des bei diesem Propheten so häufigen argumentierenden Rückgriffs auf die Schöpfung besonders naheliegend”.

<sup>1)</sup> In fact he speaks of his father as the creator of the gods.

<sup>2)</sup> SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 52. Here he says, “Wichtiger als die Frage: wer schuf die Welt? ist die Andere: wer gibt immer wieder Fruchtbarkeit und Leben?” This is the same kind of question that I am asking, but it is confused because of a false division. I am saying that it is not too important who created the gods, but it is important who creates cosmos and grants life.

<sup>3)</sup> *ANET*, p. 6, “The all-Lord said, after he had come into being: I am he who came into being as Khepri. When I had come into being, being (itself) came into being, and all beings came into being after I came into being. Many were the beings which came forth from my mouth, . . .”

<sup>4)</sup> There may be a few traditions (e.g. Gen. xiv) that preserve creation of the El type but in the main this was rejected. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 72, says, “So musste Jahwe etwa El als Schöpfer und Baal als Spender von Fruchtbarkeit und Leben entthronen und beider Königtum an sich reißen”. I can not agree with this. The Hebrews may pick up many things from El and give them to Yahweh but in the main it is the creation of the Baal type that they use.

<sup>5)</sup> Otto EISSFELDT, “Das Chaos in Der Biblischen und in Der Phönizischen Kosmogonie”, *Kleine Schriften*, Vol. II, Tübingen, pp. 258–262. After discussing the Babylonian, Greek and Biblical creation, he says that the Babylonians win in the poetical and mythological sphere; the Greeks have the best scientific and philosophical approach (after saying this he adds, “...wenn ihnen phönizische Kosmogonie hierin vielleicht auch schon ein wenig vorgearbeitet hat”. p. 261); but, the Bible wins the religious prize. He maintains that in the Bible God does create cosmos out of chaos; God does rule the sea. However, there is not a little

## IV IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Creation of the Baal type includes and binds together several elements in a rather definite form. This should do away with a great deal of confusion. It is very confusing to read MOWINCKEL's statements that seem to separate conflict and creation at Ugarit <sup>1)</sup>, and at the same time to read in his discussion of the enthronement psalms the following:

The common oriental conception of creation as the basis of the kingship of the god would therefore be a matter of course to the Israelites. We may presume that even in Israel the mythical conception of creation as a fight against *dragons* and against the *primeval ocean* must have belonged to the ideas of the festival of enthronement from the beginning.<sup>2)</sup>

Also, John GRAY has a very appealing conclusion to his article, "The Kingship of God in the Prophets and Psalm" <sup>3)</sup>, but this conflict kingship that he talks about should not be set against creation. Therefore there would be less confusion if we could see all of these parts in the creation context.

Also this study upholds the view that the enthronement psalms are older than Deutero-Isaiah <sup>4)</sup>. It is no accident that these psalms contain the necessary elements. We certainly have conflict, kingship, order and temple in Ps. xciii, and hence it has in it creation of the Baal type. This form was ready for the Hebrews at the beginning of their existence. Again, it is possible to agree with CROSS and FREEDMAN <sup>5)</sup> that Ex. xv 1-18 is very old. At least, this is a real possibility, because once again an old form is used. In connection with this song I think that it is wrong to ask if the Hebrews mythologized their history or historicized their myth? Another wrong question is

---

change. "Denn nun ist sie völlig von supranaturalistisch geistiger Gottesvorstellung beherrscht: Gott wird in keiner Weise sichtbar; er gebietet und schafft und ruft so die Welt, seine Welt ins Dasein, steht aber selbst über ihr in erhabener Majestät", p. 262.

<sup>1)</sup> See above notes 1 and 2, p. 314.

<sup>2)</sup> MOWINCKEL, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 145 f., also see p. 118.

<sup>3)</sup> GRAY, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 28. This article is very useful, but I can not follow him in his discussion of the seasonal celebration in the cult at Jerusalem—p. 22 and p. 24.

<sup>4)</sup> MOWINCKEL, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 116—118. However, I do not follow MOWINCKEL in his analysis of the cultic situation.

<sup>5)</sup> CROSS and FREEDMAN, *op. cit.*, I prefer their date to Martin NOTH's late one. However, I do think that they make the myth too remote. On the general subject of this paper I find that CROSS' recent thought is very helpful. I refer to his lecture on the "Divine Warrior" in Jerusalem, summer, 1963.

why did they choose this creation of the Baal type to represent their exodus? I am not so sure that they had a choice, in one sense, because they had rejected creation of the El type and the option were limited (Also, creation of the Baal type was more suitable). They felt that they must communicate or remember their exodus and they did it with best available means. The fact is that the language and the exodus were in tension at all times. If we consider these matters in this light, we need not wait until the time of Deutero-Isaiah, as does VON RAD <sup>1)</sup>, to unite creation and redemption. It makes no difference whether one translates קָנִית as “create” or “purchase” in Ex. xv 16 <sup>2)</sup>, because in a psalm where God controls the sea for his own purpose (He is called “Man of War”), leads his people to his mountain sanctuary, and reigns as king, one is already dealing with the subject of creation with redemptive overtones. Granted, the creation of a people is not the same as the creation of the universe, but when the same form is used for both there is a very natural fluidity of thought.

When the Hebrews looked back from the exodus to creation, they identified the god of the exodus with the god of creation. This was manageable because creation of the Baal type was used to language the exodus. It is even possible that both creation of cosmos and creation of people were tied together. It seems to me that this should guide us in all of our discussions of Gen. i 1 as to the type of creation that is involved. The type of creation is really not different just because the author has given almost all of his attention and space to filling out the seven-day framework with a description of creation <sup>3)</sup>.

When one turns to Deutero-Isaiah it is very interesting that in xlii 13 Yahweh is called “Man of War.” Starting at li 9 there is one hymn, in a series of three, which speaks of conflict, redemption, cosmos, and return to Zion. Here creation of the Baal type is used to speak of the creation of cosmos and people. This is rather complete in itself, but I am wondering if there is not at the same time a

<sup>1)</sup> VON RAD, *op. cit.*, See above, note 3, p. 320 where I think VON RAD is right in his view against SCHMIDT. There he says that there is conflict and creation in Is. li 9 ff but VON RAD does not go far enough, because he has Deutero-Isaiah bringing together conflict/creation and redemption. Note p. 191, “Von da ist dann nur noch ein kleiner Schritt zu jener eigentümlichen Ineinsetzung von Schöpfung und Erlösung, wie sie bei Deuterojesaja vollzogen ist. . . . Einzigartig ist die Koinzidenz von Schöpfung und geschichtlicher Heilstat in Jes. 51 9f”. Or again, see p. 151.

<sup>2)</sup> However, I would translate “create”. It is possible that both meanings are present if creation and redemption are unified.

<sup>3)</sup> In our apologetic moods we sometimes play down the descriptive element.

complete movement of this form which runs from li through lv. I say this because the most outstanding thing in chapter li is the conflict and in lii God is proclaimed king (lii 7) and then there is a return to Jerusalem. There seems to be overlapping but progression in each movement. God's creation (people in liii) must serve and for his servants he, the one who controls the waters (liv), will build his city, even his temple. "...This is the heritage of the servants of the Lord..." (liv 17). Finally, there is in chapter lv the great banquet. Is this just coincidence?

All of this needs additional study, but I am convinced that there is creation at Ugarit. In fact the Baal type must be distinguished from the El type and it must be seen that the Hebrews preferred creation of the Baal type in form and content. Furthermore, it was ready for them at an early period and they used it well. One difference between the Hebrew and the Canaanite belief was that for at least some of the Hebrews Yahweh would never suffer defeat, and he would never forsake even though evil times may be embarrassing and difficult to explain. The Lord will swallow up Death forever <sup>1)</sup>; Yahweh lives <sup>2)</sup>

---

<sup>1)</sup> Is. xxv 8.

<sup>2)</sup> It is interesting to note that the cosmic "man of war" builds his temple, but a human "man of war" has no such right (1 Chron. xxviii 3).